

### REMARKS

The undersigned wishes to thank Examiner Kornakov for the helpful discussions regarding the application.

Claims 80-87 have been cancelled without prejudice, and claims 88-95 have been added. No new matter has been added by virtue of the new claims. For instance, support for the new claims appears e.g. at page 3, line 14 through page 4, line 2; page 5, lines 3-4 and 21-24; page 7, lines 9-19; page 8, lines 21-26; page 9, lines 24-29; page 10, line 27 through page 11, line 20; and the original claims of the application.

Claim 80 was provisionally rejected over certain claims of application 10/335,476.

An appropriate Terminal Disclaimer is filed herewith. It is thus believed the provisional rejection has been obviated.

Claims 80-86 were rejected over Thackeray et al. (U.S. Patent 6,165,697).

Claim 87 was rejected over Thackeray et al. (U.S. Patent 6,165,697) and as evidenced by Kobayashi (U.S. Patent 6,416,825).

For the sake of brevity, the two rejections are addressed in combination.

New independent claim 88 calls for an antireflective composition that comprises i) a silsesquioxane resin and ii) an organic polymer that comprises one or more anthracene groups.


Disclosure corresponding to such an antireflective composition as recited in claim 88 has not been cited in the applied patent.

Pavelchek et al.  
U.S.S.N. 09/330,417  
Page 5

Accordingly, the rejections should be withdrawn. See, for instance, *In re Marshall*, 198 USPQ at 346 ("[r]ejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 are proper only when the claimed subject matter is identically disclosed or described in the prior art.").

It is believed the application is in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'P. Corless', with a stylized, flowing script.

Peter F. Corless (Reg. 33,860)  
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP  
P.O. Box 55874  
Boston, MA 02205  
(617) 439-4444